

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 96-2138

RUFUS SUTTLES, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

SHIRLEY S. CHATER, COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL
SECURITY,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Columbia. Patrick Michael Duffy, District
Judge. (CA-93-1856-3-23-BC)

Submitted: February 13, 1997 Decided: February 25, 1997

Before WIDENER and HAMILTON, Circuit Judges, and BUTZNER, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Rufus Suttles, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Ronald Lamar Paxton, UNITED
STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES, Atlanta, Georgia, for
Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Appellant appeals the district court's order affirming the denial of social security benefits. Appellant's case was referred to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (1994). The magistrate judge recommended that relief be denied and advised Appellant that failure to file specific, timely objections to this recommendation could waive appellate review of a district court order based upon the recommendation. Despite this warning, Appellant filed, at best, only general objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation. Such general, non-specific objections are not sufficient. See Howard v. Secretary, 932 F.2d 505, 508-09 (6th Cir. 1991); Orpiano v. Johnson, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1985).

The timely filing of specific objections to a magistrate judge's recommendation is necessary to preserve appellate review of the substance of that recommendation when the parties have been warned that failure to object will waive appellate review. Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985). See generally Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Appellant has waived appellate review by failing to file specific objections after receiving proper notice. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED